



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,176	08/31/2004	Jun Ooyabu	258084US0PCT	8297

22850 7590 01/04/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DHINGRA, RAKESH KUMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/505,176	OOYABU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rakesh K. Dhingra	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,805,952).

Regarding Claim 1: Chang et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figure 2) comprising:

a chamber (processing vessel) 152 in which a plasma therein is excited to perform microprocessing on a surface of a wafer (object) 170 to be processed; and lower electrode 162 and showerhead 154 (in-chamber component) disposed inside the processing vessel 152,

wherein chamber wall 172, showerhead 154, substrate support 168 (at least one of surfaces of the processing vessel's inner wall and the in-chamber components) is coated with an Y2O3 sprayed coating 160 over a predetermined area (Column 6, line 25 to Column 7, line10 and Claim 1).

Regarding Claim 5: Chang et al teach (Figure 2) lower electrode 162 as in-chamber component (Column 6, lines 25-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-4, 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,805,952) in view of Harada et al (US Patent No. 6,783,863).

Regarding Claims 2-4: Chang et al teach all limitations of the claim except relationship between coating thickness, gas flow rate and surface area of coating.

Harada et al teach internal members for a plasma treating vessel like electrodes, focus ring, deposit shields etc where such internal members are given a top coating of Y₂O₃ to enable the member have excellent resistance to plasma erosion and chemical corrosion and that Y₂O₃ coatings have thickness of 50-2000 microns.

Art Unit: 1763

(Abstract, Column 1, lines 5-20, Column 2, lines 20-65). Harada et al further teach (Example 2, Columns 7 line 30 to Column 8, line 50) that for a specific size of substrate and for a specified coating thickness, good test results against plasma erosion were achieved by controlling relevant process parameters like gas flow rate, pressure and high frequency power output. Thus surface area and coating thickness are process related variables and could be optimized.

In this regard courts have ruled (Case law):

“It is well settled that determination of optimum values of cause effective variables such as these process parameters is within the skill of one practicing in the art. *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).”

“It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum value of a cause effective variable such as [spray droplet size] through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).”

“Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum values of the relevant process parameters through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).”

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize surface area and thickness of Y₂O₃ coating as taught by Harada et al in the apparatus of Chang et al to achieve desired resistance to plasma erosion and chemical corrosion (Abstract).

Regarding Claims 6,7: Chang et al in view of Harada et al teach all structural limitations of the claim (as explained above) except intended use limitations of the apparatus .

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding intended use, it has been held by the courts (Case law):

“A claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).”

“It is well settled that the intended use of a claimed apparatus is not germane to the issue of the patentability of the claimed structure. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the claimed use then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 459 (CCPA 1963).”

“Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does *Hewlett-Packard Co. V. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 15USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990)”.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Sun et al (US Patent No. 6,776,873) teach applying Y2O3 coating (ceramic based protective coating) on anodized surfaces of chamber components improves resistance to erosion and corrosion (Summary).

Kaushal et al (US PG PUB No. 2004/0033385) teach an apparatus (Figure 1) where chamber wall 11, chamber process kit 14 and dielectric window 20 are made from components that have Y2O3 coating. Kaushal et al further teaches that such coatings can be given by PV, CVD or plasma spraying process (Paragraphs 0013, 0033-0036). Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rakesh K. Dhingra whose telephone number is (571)-272-5959. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 -6:00 (Monday - Friday).

Art Unit: 1763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571)-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Rakesh Dhingra



Parviz Hassanzadeh
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763